



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/319,490 10/07/94 ESCH

H 21633593200F

HENDRICKSON, S. J.  
EXAMINER

11M1/0501

CUSHMAN DARBY & CUSHMAN  
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE NW  
NINTH FLOOR EAST TOWER  
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3918

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1103

DATE MAILED: 05/01/95

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 4/3/95 ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), — days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
- ☒ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☒ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. (2)
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
- ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
- ☐

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

- ☒ Claims 1-6 are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claims 5-6 are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claims have been cancelled.
- ☐ Claims are allowed.
- ☒ Claims 1 are rejected.
- ☐ Claims are objected to.
- ☒ Claims 1-6 are subject to restriction or election requirement.
- ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
- ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
- ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on —. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
- ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on —, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed —, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. —; filed on —.
- ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Serial Number: 08/319,490

-2-

Art Unit: 1103

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1) and M.P.E.P. § 608.01(1). Correction of the following is required: there is no disclosure of "DBP/CTAB=1.2 to 3.9".

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a) The parameters in claim 1 are somewhat inconsistent; if for example DBP/CTAB is 1.2-3.9 and DBP is 150-300, then CTAB would have to be 250 or less, or else there would be a conflict.
- b) In lines 7-8, "(V2= ... consumption)" is unclear as to what it means, if it limits the claim and what is intended to be within the parentheses.
- c) In line 12,  $V_1$  is undefined;  $V_2$  also appears to be undefined.
- d) In line 6, ",PV" appears to be unnecessary.
- e) In line 7, "ml" is not the correct unit for density.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --  
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made. Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Evaluations of the level of ordinary skill in the art require consideration of such factors as various prior art approaches, types of problems encountered in the art, rapidity with which innovations are made, sophistication of technology involved, educational background of those actively working in the field, commercial success, and failure of others.

The "person having ordinary skill" in this art has the capability of understanding the scientific and engineering principles applicable to the claimed invention. The evidence of record including the references and/or the admissions are considered to reasonably reflect this level of skill.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Lagarde et al.

The reference teaches in col.2 lines 5-35 and col.9 lines 1-10 silica having BET 242, CTAB 237, BET/CTAB=1.02. The other properties, to the extent the claim can be comprehended, are deemed inherently possessed since the BET, CTAB and their ratio are the same as claimed; where the examiner has found substantially the same product as claimed in the art but cannot determine whether the reference inherently meets the claimed limitations, the burden is upon the applicant to show a difference; In re Fitzgerald et al. 205 USPQ 594.

Serial Number: 08/319,490

-4-

Art Unit: 1103

To the extent that the examples are not considered anticipatory, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make silica having the claimed properties since doing so provides a fine silica having properties desired by Lagarde col. 1 lines 65-68. With regard to the overlapping general values disclosed in col. 2 lines 1-35, (also taught is a particle size of essentially less than 45 microns), the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected the overlapping portion of the range disclosed by the reference because overlapping ranges have been held to be a prima facie case of obviousness, see *In re Malagari*, 182 U.S.P.Q. 549.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format of an Abstract of the Disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not

Serial Number: 08/319,490


-5-

Art Unit: 1103

exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited.

The last 9 lines should be deleted and the DBP/CTAB corrected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (703) 308-2539.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stuart Hendrickson", with a stylized, cursive script.

Stuart Hendrickson  
examiner Art Unit 1103